

Claim 5, line 3, change "to" to --on--;

Claim 6, lines 3 and 4, change "water filtering mesh  
material supported by the frame" to --said mesh  
material--;

Claim 7, line 2, change "1" to --12--;

Claim 8, line 2, change "3" to --7--;

Claim 9, line 2, change "1" to --12--;  
line 3, change "carried on the structure" to  
-- coupled to the frame--;

Claim 10, line 1, cancel "structure";  
line 2, change "1" to --12--.

#### REMARKS

Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice and new  
Claim 12 has been added.

Claims 2, 7, 9 and 10 have been amended so that they are  
now dependent upon newly added Claim 12 rather than on  
cancelled Claim 1. Claim 8 has been amended so that it is  
now dependent upon Claim 7 rather than on Claim 3.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10 have been amended to more  
clearly define the invention.

The rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second  
paragraph, as being indefinite on the ground that there is  
insufficient antecedent basis for the term "the block" in  
the parent Claim 3 is no longer considered applicable in

view of the presence of the term "block" in the present parent Claim 7.

The rejection of Claims 2,4 and 9-12 as anticipated by Wallingford et al. is considered to lack merit.

The Wallingford et al. patent is not considered to teach, or even suggest, even the filter defined by Claim 12, the most generic claim.

Unlike the filter defined by Claim 12, the filter of the Wallingford et al. patent does not have a scale collector coupled to the frame of the mesh material and separate from the mesh material. As clearly shown in the figures of the drawing and page 1, lines 26-64, of the Wallingford et al. patent there is no scale collector coupled to the wire framework C' of its wire cloth C'.

There is even no suggestion, in this patent, of the presence of any scale collector coupled to any portion of the filter structure shown therein.

The rejection of Claims 2,3,5 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.P 102(b) as anticipated by Trably is considered to lack merit.

Trably is not considered to teach, or even suggest the filter defined by even Claim 12, the most generic claim defined by this group.

Unlike the filter defined by Claim 12, the filter of Trably does not have a scale collector, separate from the mesh material (the filter cloths of Trably) for collecting scale.

The rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Wallingford et al. or Trably is considered to lack merit.

Neither the Wallingford et al nor Trably is considered to teach, or even suggest the filter defined by Claim 5, for reasons given, supra in regard to parent Claim 12. Additionally, neither of this patents, even suggest the presence of any scale collector , or even any other collector, separate from the mesh material and removable mounted on a carrier member on the frame of the mesh material.

The rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Wallingford et al. or Trably is considered to lack merit.

Neither the Wallingford et al. patent nor, Trably is considered to teach, or even suggest the filter defined by Claim 7 for reasons given in regard to parent Claim 12.

In addition, neither of these patents is considered to teach, or even suggest, the presence of a compacted mesh block, in addition to the mesh material supported by a

frame, as is present in the filter defined by the instant claim.

The allowability of the subject matter of Claims 6 and 8 is noted.

An early allowance of the claims and case is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Norman N. Spain  
Norman N. Spain Reg.17,846  
Consulting Patent Attorney  
(914) 333-9625

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

On Feb. 7, 2001

By Norman N. Spain